

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF SONNING PARISH COUNCIL  
PLANNING COMMITTEE HELD ON MONDAY 18 JULY 2018 AT 6.00PM  
IN THE PAVILION, POUND LANE, SONNING.**

PRESENT: Mr A Farnese (Chairman), Mr T Fisher, Mrs P Pownall.  
Mrs L Bates (Clerk), 3 visitors.

APOLOGIES: Apologies were received from Mr P Morrison (unexpected emergency). The Chairman welcomed all those present.

**AGENDA**

- a) Present.
- b) Apologies for Absence
- c) Declaration of Interest
- d) Minutes of 2 July 2018 to approve.
- e) Updates
- f) 4 Seagrave Close (181776). Householder application for the proposed erection of single storey rear extension to dwelling. 25/07/19
- g) York Cottage Parson Road (181800 & 181801). Householder and Listed application for the proposed erection of part single storey side, part two storey side/rear to dwelling including a rear dormer. 25/07/18
- h) Pool Court (181850). Householder application for the proposed erection of single storey detached to create garage and ancillary accommodation. 01/08/18
- i) Any matters considered urgent by the Chairman.
- j) Date of the Next Meeting.

1985 DECLARATION OF INTEREST/DISPENSATIONS.

There were no declarations of interest.

1986 MINUTES.

The Minutes of the 2 July, having been circulated, were taken as read and signed by the Chairman.

1987 UPDATES.

The Chairman said that the appeal at Sonning Golf Club for 13 houses had been upheld and the appeal at Sonning Field for the RBCS car park had been dismissed. The application for a certificate of Lawfulness (180090) at 22 Pound Lane had been declared not lawful as had the prior notification application at Holme Park Farm (180065). There was one new applications 5 Old Bath Road (181972) for the proposed erection of a single storey rear extension following demolition of existing.

1988 YORK COTTAGE (181800 & 181801).

The Chairman said that the Bat Survey had shown that there was evidence of maternal nesting and some evidence of long eared brown bats. Further surveys would be necessary if the proposed work went ahead under the supervision of a licenced ecologist. The ecologist would remove the bats to a bat box previously erected prior to the works. The extended house should ensure that replacement roost opportunities would continue to be available to bats. A list of ways this would be achieved was provided in the survey. The Chairman had visited the site but none of the neighbours were at home and the property was currently unoccupied. However the owners of Sarum Cottage were in attendance and wished to object to the proposal. They felt that the proposal extension and dormer window would dominate the view and obstruct their evening light. Given the footprint of the existing cottage they felt the extension was a substantial addition. The by-fold doors leading out from the kitchen into the garden were too modern for the building but they would accept a single storey

extension. There were also concerns that they had not been informed by WBC about the proposal and no site notice had been displayed. In regards to the summer house/shed in the garden the owners of Sarum Cottage felt that this was again too large for the location and would be overbearing on their garden. Again they were concerned that none of the neighbours had been informed by WBC and no site notice had been displayed. The Chairman said that SPC would not make the final decision, the planning department was overworked, the conservation office worked from home as did some planning officers and one officer had 44 application delegated to him. Things were not working as smoothly as they might at the WBC planning department. Following discussion it was agreed to object to both applications. On the extension, concerns included the size and height of the proposal, out of keeping with the area and it would be suggested that the proposal be revisited and a single storey extension considered. Mention should be made about the necessity to follow the proposals in the Bat Survey if the proposal was granted. On the summer house/shed objections would be made to the size and scale and that it would be overbearing in the relatively small garden.

1989 4 SEAGROVE CLOSE (181776)

The Chairman said that his was for a very small extension to form a sunroom off the kitchen. The development had been laid out beautifully with each house being of an individual design and the proposed extension was in keeping with the design of the property. Following discussion it was agreed to say the parish Council could find no reason to object.

1990 POOL COURT (181850).

Mr Fisher said that this was similar to the previous proposal but the building was slightly smaller and the position had been altered. While appreciating the reduction in size the proposed building would be in the area that had been made available by the illegal removal of the Coast Redwood. Mr Gilmore had said that he had no concerns about the re-siting of the building as it was further away from his property but had concerns about the way the boundary between the garden and the field was being altered. Following discussion it was agreed to object due to the illegal removal of the Coast Cedar.

1991 MATTERS CONSIDERED URGENT BY THE CHAIRMAN.

There were no urgent matters.

1992. DATE OF THE OF THE NEXT MEETING. The next planning meeting would be held On Monday 6 August at 6.00pm in the Pavilion.

Signed.....Dated.....